

to a distinct subspecies. That modern American zoologists would probably separate this local form as a distinct species I am quite aware; but such a procedure would, as in other cases, have the great disadvantage of suppressing all signs of the evident relationship existing between the two forms, without gaining any greater local exactness than may be obtained by the free use of trinomial nomenclature.

Sciurus Aberti durangi, subsp. n.

Size and general characters of *S. A. typicus* *. Sides of nose from muzzle to eye rufous, as opposed to the "grey cheeks" of *typicus*; a ring round eye paler rufous. Ears entirely without tufts (type killed in middle of October); no chestnut or rufous spots round or behind their bases. Hairs of chest and belly slaty grey basally, as compared to "pure white" in *typicus*. Whole under surface of tail inwards of the submarginal black band coarsely grizzled grey, each hair being broadly banded with black and white; in *typicus* the under surface of the tail is "wholly white." Median part of dorsal surface of metatarsus dark-coloured, proximally like the lower leg, terminally with a rufous tinge; inner side of metatarsus and tops of toes white. Descriptions of *typicus* simply say "feet white."

Hab. Ciudad, Durango, Central Mexico; alt. 8100 feet, on the Sierra Madre.

Type B. M. 82. 3. 20. 16. Female, killed Oct. 14, 1881; a second specimen killed Aug. 7. Coll. A. Forrer.

XI.—*Note on the History of the so-called Family Teichonidæ.*
By ARTHUR DENDY, D.Sc., F.L.S., Melbourne University.

IN reply to my note on "The Discovery of the True Nature of the so-called Family Teichonidæ," published in the 'Zoologischer Anzeiger' (no. 395), Dr. R. von Lendenfeld, in no. 402 of the same journal, endeavours to prove that he

* It appears to me equally simple and exact, while far more euphonious, to use the word *typicus* for the typical subspecies, instead of doubling the specific name, as is commonly done. The original author's name should of course be appended after *typicus*. The ugly sound of a double specific name is always bad enough; but if that method is adhered to, we may in some cases have to employ three repetitions of the same word, e. g. *Lutra lutra lutra*, Linn., instead of (if like generic and specific are admitted) *Lutra lutra typica*, L., or, most euphonious of all, *Lutra vulgaris typica*, Erxl. This possibility of a treble repetition may well make us hesitate before insisting on the same word being used for both species and typical subspecies

arrived at his results quite independently of my work, and refuses to recognize that I have any claim to priority in the matter.

He bases his defence upon a preliminary communication entitled "Das System der Kalkschwämme," which he informs us that he read before the Vienna Academy on the 8th of January 1891, and which he accuses me of wilfully ignoring, although, as a matter of fact, I have never seen the paper in question up to the present moment.

My principal work on the "Teichonidæ" was published in January 1891, though written in Australia many months previously; hence, of course, it is possible that Dr. von Lendenfeld may not have seen it before he wrote his preliminary account, though that can be no excuse for not referring to it in his complete work ("Die Spongien der Adria"), which is not even dated till April 1891, and not published till the following December.

It is evident from Dr. von Lendenfeld's writings that he has never personally studied the group of sponges whose true nature he claims to have independently arrived at, and hence to an outsider it is difficult to see what could have induced him so suddenly to abandon the family "Teichonidæ" and adopt my views as to the relationships of the sponges comprised therein.

I would therefore like to point out, for the benefit of those who might otherwise be misled by Dr. von Lendenfeld's statements:—(1) That on November 14th, 1889, I communicated a paper on "The Pseudogastrula-stage in the Development of Calcareous Sponges" to the Royal Society of Victoria; (2) that in this paper I gave a preliminary account of the results of my researches on the anatomy of "*Teichonella labyrinthica*" and "*T. prolifera*," stating distinctly that "*T. labyrinthica*" is a true Sycon and "*T. prolifera*" a typical Leucon; and (3) that I sent a copy of this paper to Dr. von Lendenfeld.

In short, my main conclusions as to the structure and relationships of the "Teichonidæ" (with the exception of "*Eilhardia Schulzei*," concerning which we both owe our anatomical information to Poléjaeff) were published and received in Europe many months before the date on which Dr. von Lendenfeld says he read the preliminary paper on which he bases his remarkable claim to independent discovery.

As I have pointed out previously, Mr. Carter himself was the first to show that "*Teichonella labyrinthica*" is a true Sycon; but this statement of his had passed quite unnoticed,

and no correct account of the anatomy of the sponge in question had appeared until the publication of my work.

I am aware that in his "Monograph of the Australian Sponges" (Proc. Linn. Soc. N. S. W. vol. ix. p. 1140) Dr. von Lendenfeld accepted the "family" with some hesitation. He says, "I have not seen any representatives of this family myself, but am of opinion that they might perhaps be considered as colonies of *Leucones* or *Sycones*, as Marshall asserted before Poléjaeff's essay was published." He also says of "*Teichonella labyrinthica*" (*loc. cit.* p. 1142), "The anatomy of this sponge is totally unknown, so that its name and position here are only preliminary." How near Marshall's opinion came to the truth of the matter spongologists will be able to judge for themselves. Since the publication of the above remarks Dr. von Lendenfeld has repeatedly maintained the "family *Teichonidæ*," and continued to do so until the very year in which my preliminary results were published. In other words, from 1885 till 1890 Dr. von Lendenfeld stuck to the family; then, when the outcome of my researches on "*T. labyrinthica*" and "*T. prolifera*" had been published and sent to him, he suddenly dropped the "family" and adopted my views without giving any reasons for so doing. Surely it is taxing our credulity too much to ask us to believe that he arrived at his results independently!

Melbourne,
November 8, 1892.

XII.—*Description of a new Species of the Cicadan Genus Pœcilopsaltria.* By W. L. DISTANT.

THE very beautiful species here described was obtained by Herrn P. Frey at Nossi-Bé, an island near the north-west coast of Madagascar. Dr. Karl Brancsik, who has already commenced to publish the results of this expedition ('*Jahreshefte des naturw. Vereines des Trencsiner Comitates*,' 1890-91, xiii. u. xiv. Jahrg.), has submitted a specimen to me for identification, which proves to be a perfectly new species.

Pœcilopsaltria Brancsiki, sp. n.

♀. Head and thorax above ochraceous, the lateral and posterior margins of the pronotum greenish ochraceous. Head with a cruciform spot at centre of front and a spot at each basal angle of same, a broken transverse fascia between